



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/071,352	02/08/2002	Eric Auvray	SCP 055914 DIV.1	6297

7590 06/23/2005

EXAMINER

LE, VU

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2613

DATE MAILED: 06/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/071,352	AUVRAY ET AL.	
	Examiner Vu Le	Art Unit 2613	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 March 2005.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) _____ is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 24 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Simon et al, US 4,918,523 in view of Ferre et al, US 4,707,738.

Re claim 24, Simon et al discloses a method for decoding a sequence of pictures (figs. 2, 16, 48), wherein each picture is divided into blocks of picture elements (col. 4, line 67 to col. 5, line 10), each block being represented by a luminance block and two chrominance blocks (col. 7, lines 5-47) and wherein an inter coding takes into account a previous picture and an intra coding is independent from the previous picture (col. 6, lines 32-45, fig. 2:230 also fig. 16, details of 230).

Simon fails to disclose the limitations of "for intra coded blocks the coding using weighting coefficients, high spatial frequencies are less weighted than low spatial frequencies and using the same weighting coefficients for coding of the luminance block and the chrominance blocks wherein a first coefficient of the intra coded blocks is not modified by the weighting coefficients" as now claimed.

Ferre et al teaches (fig. 6) the step of using the same weighting coefficients (23) of the spatial frequencies for both intra (33) and inter (32) coding via switch (22, col. 8, line 65 – col. 9, line 14), wherein high spatial frequencies are less weighted than low

spatial frequencies and said weighting coefficients have the same values, apart from the application of a multiplication constant (see col. 8, line 65 to col. 9, line 14) and also suggests such decoding method may be used for luminance block and chrominance blocks (col. 11, lines 33-37). The weighting is represented by the mathematical expression $[\exp(u^2 + v^2)/15^2]$ (see top of col. 9), wherein u and v being respectively the index of the row and the index of column of the coefficient being coded in the transformation matrix. Hence, for the first coefficient of the intra-coded block, the values for u and v are zeros, which causes the above-mentioned mathematical expression i.e. weighting to equal zero. Consequently, the first coefficient of the intra-coded block is not modified.

Therefore, taking the combined teaching of Simon and Ferre as a whole, it would have been obvious and advantageous to incorporate dynamically weighting the transformed coefficients for either intra-coded block or inter-coded block for the benefit of reducing coded data quantity of luminance and chrominance components of video data that vary in complexities without sacrificing significant visual quality (Ferre, col. 5, lines 39-51).

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 24 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

5. Claims 17, 18 and 23 have been cancelled.

Terminal Disclaimer

6. Applicant's remarks with respect to nullifying the Terminal Disclaimer requirement is persuasive. It is conceded that MPEP 1490 (A) indicates that "the filing of a continuing application other than a CPA, while abandoning the application in which the terminal disclaimer has been filed, will typically nullify the effect of a terminal

disclaimer". In that effect, the requirement to file the terminal disclaimer as required by the petition decision of September 29, 1995 is withdrawn.

Contact

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vu Le whose telephone number is (571) 272-7332. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mehrdad Dastouri can be reached on (571) 272-7418. Customer Service can be reached at (571) 272-2600. The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Vu Le
Primary Examiner
AU 2613
(571) 272-7332
Vu.Le@uspto.gov